

-13-

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on January 11, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-35 are pending in this Application. Claim 1, 13, 25 and 29 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-19, 21, 22, 25, 26 and 28-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,951,652 to Ingrassia Jr, et al. (hereinafter Ingrassia) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,230,171 to Pacifici et al. (hereinafter Pacifici) and U.S. Patent No. 5,774,670 to Montulli.

The Examiner stated that Ingrassia does not teach extracting document state information. Claim 1 recites extracting state information which includes document state information. Accordingly, Ingrassia does not teach claim 1. The Examiner further stated that Ingrassia teaches storing the state information (the state information includes document state information). By the Examiner's own admission, Ingrassia does not teach capturing documents state information, therefore since Ingrassia does not capture document state information, Ingrassia cannot store document state information. Further, the Examiner stated that Ingrassia teaches setting a document property of each document contained in a browser to a common value in response to detecting the intent to initiate a collaboration session. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Ingrassia teaches a Session Id which is synchronized. The Session ID is not a document property, since it is related to a session and not to a document. Pacifici and Montulli also fail to disclose or suggest "setting a document property of each document contained in the browser to a common value". If the Examiner is to maintain this rejection he is asked to specifically point out in the prior art where the prior art teaches:

i) state information including a document state, a session state associated with the browser and at least one of document cookies, application session cookies and communications session cookies; and

-14-

ii) setting a document property of each document contained in the browser to a common value.

Further, Applicants submit that the combination of Ingrassia, Pacifici and Montulli is improper. It is well established that in order to combine references there must be some "suggestion of desirability of the combination". In re Noznik, Tatter and Obenauf, 178 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1973). Additionally the test of obviousness is not whether the prior art can be modified to produce the claimed invention, since under such a test all inventions would be obvious. Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Manufacturing Co., 810 F.2d 1561, 1574-75 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further still Ingrassia, Pacific and Montulli are all in different class/subclass designations. Ingrassia is listed in class/subclass G06F 13/14, Pacifici in class/subclass G06F 13/38 and Montulli in class/subclass G06F 17/21. The Patent Office has designated the three references in different class/subclasses, further indicating that the references are different and should not be combined. For all the reasons stated above, the combination of Ingrassia, Pacific and Montulli is improper and the rejection should be removed.


In view of all the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome paving the claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-15-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS00-2909

Dated: March 22, 2006